DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 423 EA 011 030

AUTHOR Parker, James C.
TITLE From Conventional Wisdom to Concept: School Administration, 1934-1945.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978); Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; School Community Relationship; Social Change

ABSTRACT

The period from 1934 to 1945 witnessed a number of changes in education and in school administration. Teachers' problems were common. For example, teachers were only minimally prepared for their positions, especially in rural areas, and teachers' salaries were low. Secondary curriculum moved from college preparation to preparation for life. A debate was in progress about whether schools ought to be the agents or the leaders of society. Increasing attention was paid to experimental methods in analyzing school problems. The period saw a significant rise in the number of full-time administrators, as school districts consolidated and states began to certify administrators. Administrators began to be differentiated by roles and responsibilities. Secondary education was growing and with it the importance of the secondary principalship. The level of administrators' degree attainment was rising. Supervision changed from inspectorial to a focus on improvement of teaching. The new school administrator would now have to be effective in problem-solving and group dynamics, as well as financial planning. Leading writers like Jesse Newlon were adding social theory and social psychology to administration curricula, along with the standard finance and management. Others continued to stress efficient management and record-keeping. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED162423

FROM CONVENTIONAL WISDOM TO CONCEPT: SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, 1934-1945

by

James C. Parker

Southern Illinois University
at Carbondale

American Educational Research Association

March 27-31
1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James C. Parker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EA 011 030

INTRODUCTION

School administration textbook writers during this period sought to interpret and apply two opposing educational philosophies: the school as the agency of society and the school as the pioneer of society.[1] Partly in reaction to the unquestioning scientism of the then conventional school administration wisdom and partly in reaction to the economic and social upheaval of the Great Depression, the writers struggled to formulate a new conception of school administration based on cooperation, participation and democracy. But they were reluctant to denigrate conventional wisdom. Thus, with two exceptions, the textbooks reviewed for this paper present a dualism characteristic of the period: distilled conventional wisdom and fermenting concept. Newlon, the analytic philosopher, and Koopman, Miel and Misner, the practitioner engineers, are the exceptions; they throughout their books advocate and demonstrate the emerging concepts of cooperation, participation and democracy.

Writers of textbooks reviewed in detail were overwhelmingly men and professors of education or secondary education. Only one, Alice Miel, instructor at Teachers College, Columbia, was female and only one, Dennis Cooke of George Peabody College for Teachers, was designated in his book at the time of publication a professor of school administration.

In an attempt to depict and characterize this period as revealed through school administration textbooks, answers to the following questions will be attempted. What influences and problems inherited from preceding years continued during the 1930's and 1940's? How did the literature of the period define and describe school administration? And, what were the purposes and functions of school administration?

Teacher Preparation

Although much progress had been made in the preparation of teachers during the previous quarter century, lack of preparation for teaching continued to concern school administration textbook writers. Many elementary and secondary schools, rural and urban, continued to be "...filled with raw recruits drawn from the upper elementary and high school grades, with meager academic equipment and with little or no previous pedagogic guidance."[1] Data from the National Survey of the Education of Teachers, commissioned by Congress and published in 1933, tend to support this unpreparedness notion. The National Survey showed that 26% of all teachers nationally had one year or less of college work. Forty-six percent had two years of college, sixteen percent had three years, and ten percent had four years. About two percent had one or more years of graduate work.[2] Teachers with the least amount of preparation were usually found in small, rural schools while those with the most preparation were usually found in the cities. Supervision, in-service training, and the demonstration lesson were not luxuries, they were necessities.[3] The standard was two years of preparation to teach elementary school; three years, junior high; four years, high school.[4]

Since the National Survey also showed that there were more than enough "technically certified people" to fill all existing vacancies, writers urged that preparation and certification standards be raised not only to establish a profession of teaching comparable to law, medicine, and engineering but also to prevent persons from coming into teaching because of unemployment in their chosen occupations.

Teacher Training Institutions

In the 1930's the two year normal schools, some of which had originally been secondary schools, were rapidly transforming themselves into teachers' colleges, requiring generally the completion of a four year high school program for admission and a four year college program for graduation. This was seen by one writer, Samuel E. Weber, Associate Superintendent in Charge of Personnel, Pittsburg, PA, to herald ". . . the dawn of a teaching profession in the United States."[5] So encouraged was he by the teachers colleges' exaction of higher admission and graduation standards, as well as by the competition for jobs caused by teacher over-supply, that he predicted by the 1950's the untrained and incompetent would be largely eliminated.[6]

Certification agencies and regional accrediting associations relied heavily on teacher training institutions to enforce established standards in terms of degrees, hours, credits and courses and thereby to determine who would become eligible to teach. Teacher training institutions were implored to analyze carefully the positions for which they were offering training so that they would not graduate or surely not certify anyone illqualified to hold a teaching position. One writer warned that "The alternative point of view is for the teacher-training institution to regard itself as a kind of factory, turning out a product which meets only the coarse legal specifications, hustling for orders, and placing teachers on the basis of competition with other training agencies. Such an outlook is too much one of responsibility to the teacher candidate rather than to the pupils who are to be taught."[7]

Teacher Certification

Originally a local school district function, the certification of teachers gradually became a state function. The trend during the period under consideration was definitely toward abolition of local certificates and

centralization of certification authority in the hands of state superintendents of instruction.[8] Too, because accrediting and certification standards were being defined in academic and professional course-work terms, teacher certification based on scholastic attainment at and on credentials from recognized institutions began to supercede local and state written examinations.

As state superintendents took over the certifying function, there was a general reduction in types of certificates issued.[9] The state office in its ". . .detachment from those personal, pecuniary, and political influences which must always surround the actual employing situation. . ." was a logical place to bring a degree of standardization to teacher certification thereby making credentials valid over a wider area. Another effect of state certification was to limit the field of applicants and to indicate certain minimum attainments and qualifications.[10]

Although there was considerable variation among the states concerning certification standards, Koos and others wrote in 1940 that there were certain recognized requirements for high school teachers.

> For teachers of academic subjects most states now require graduation from a recognized four-year institution as the basic training necessary for the best certificate obtainable by a person without teaching experience. All but a few states stipulate the completion of professional education courses, the number of semester hours required ranging from 6 to 24. Teachers of the special subjects are required to possess "special" certificates. Not all states recognize the same subjects as "special," but in general the principle of specialized preparation is recognized for music, art, physical education, industrial arts, home economics, agriculture, and commerce.[11]

Since the states over time were setting standards higher and higher, there was some advocacy for certification to carry the force of legislative enactments. Such action in Louisiana was cited as the reason that there were enough prepared teachers ". . .to fill every teaching position in the state."[12]

Teacher Salaries and Load

Teachers' salaries have historically lagged behind income levels of other professions requiring like amounts of preparation. Just prior to the Great Depression because teachers' salaries were so low and because there were few candidates from which to choose, boards of education had ". . .doubled teachers' salaries. Most of this increase came during the period 1919 - 1922."[13] Teachers' salaries reached their highest levels in 1930-31. But prolonged economic depression forced widespread salary reductions so that by 1934-35, the average teacher's salary was only about 85 percent of the 1930-31 level. By 1938-39 salaries had regained 2/3 of the ground lost.[14] Salaries did not fully recover ground lost until after World War II.[15]

Besides the devastating effects of the Depression, two other factors, according to Weber, contributed during the 1930's and early 1940's to a precarious salary situation. They were ". . .1. The overproduction of teacher-supply by competing state-supported institutions and by private higher institutions offering like courses; 2. The district system [ward boards] of school administration which readily lends itself to a devastating competition, preventing the raising of both standards and wages,"[16] Weber recommended in his textbook an Annapolis or West Point-like selection system to choose persons to be trained as teachers and thus to remedy the problems cited. But such was not to be the case.

Salaries in 1930-31, the year they were the highest, ranged from a median low in small towns (population: 2,500-5,000) of $1200 per year for junior high teachers to a median high in the largest cities (population: 100,000+) of $2800 for senior high school teachers. (The range for the median low $1200 figure was $700-$1900 per year.) By 1938-39 comparable median salary figures were $1283 for junior high teachers and $2672 for senior high teachers. In

the recovery process, junior high teachers obviously fared better than senior high teachers. Elementary teachers' salaries were below those of their secondary school counterparts and in 1938-39 ranged from a median low in small towns of $1096 per year to a median high of $2217 in the largest cities.[17] In 1940 the average salary for all teachers was $1325 per year.[18]

Although teachers' salaries and other public employees' salaries did not drop percentagewise as drastically as lawyers, physicians and surgeons, and dentists in the private sector, these private sector salaries never reached the absolute low levels of teachers' salaries.[19] Koos and others commenting about teachers' salaries during the worst of the Depression said:

> The position of teachers is decidedly unfavorable, even though their incomes remained relatively stable during the early depression years. It is true that most lawyers, physicians, and dentists are men and that most teachers are women, but it is nevertheless a fact that the attraction of capable persons (especially capable men) into the teaching profession is difficult when other occupations requiring similar ability and training are so much better rewarded.[20]

They argued for a cost of living factor in any salary schedule and observed that the prevailing salaries for teachers assumed celibacy and no dependents; this they said caused teaching to be a "procession rather than a profession."[21]

Generally, the textbook writers argued for a single salary schedule for both elementary and secondary teachers. They deplored the "Blue Law" prohibitions of some teachers' contracts and the practice of some school districts in not hiring married women or in terminating women teachers when they married.[22] Because the teaching profession was overwhelmingly female the textbook writers, urging correction of imbalance, advocated that men's salaries remain higher than women's, a common practice at the time.[23] (The 1933 National Survey of the Education of Teachers showed 75.8 percent of junior high teachers female and 65.1 percent of senior high teachers female.[24] Butts reported that in 1934 80 percent of all teachers were female.[25]) The writers searched for a

salary schedule formula by which to raise salaries; but lacking any real authority to raise monies, they had to settle for explicating principles of salary administration. The principles stated usually included the following: prepare a definite compensation plan, research average practice in surrounding communities, include a cost of living factor for your specific community, consider grade level taught, consider amount of training possessed, recognize length of experience, consider individuals' competency, and do not ignore the criterion of supply and demand.[26]

As in the case of salary, textbook writers sought a formula by which to measure teachers' loads. One often repeated device was the relative weighting of a subject area against other areas. A table of the relative weights of subjects as devised by Lyon county, Kansas High School teachers was cited by several writers.[27]

Junior high, senior high, and atypical classes were all larger in 1935-36 than in 1930-31. Only in kindergarten classes were enrollments smaller, reflecting a population decrease spurred by the Depression.[28] The writers made suggestions -- eliminate small high schools, departmentalize grades 7-12 and assign teachers to subject areas vertically rather than by grades horizontally, and limit the number of subjects which a teacher was certified to teach. But not until schools could be better financed and the population decline work its way upward through the grades was there to be much change.[29]

These teacher problems were not new, but they continued to occupy much space in school administration textbooks. And there were other problems as well. One of these concerned the small school and related to teacher preparation, salary and load problems already mentioned.

ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS

Small and Rural Elementary Schools

There continued in the 1930's and 1940's textbook writers who addressed the work of the teacher-administrator. Elementary School Organization and Management (published in 1936) by Dougherty, Gorman and Phillips and How To Manage a Rural School (published in 1942) by Culp are examples of books which continued to address a hundred year old school administration problem.[30] Both of these books obviously met an accepting audience, for Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips published a revised edition in 1950 and Culp's book went into its seventh printing in 1947. These books addressed problems of the small elementary school and its teacher.

Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips wrote: "While the book is specifically designed to be used in connection with the training and practices of the classroom teachers, yet the elementary school principal and probably the supervisor may find it useful."[31] It was not until the 1950 revised edition that a chapter on "The Elementary School Principal" was added.

Indicating that rural classes were taught by "raw recruits" mentioned earlier in this paper, Culp said of his How To Manage A Rural School: "This material was prepared for students in training. Much of the available material in Rural School Management was found to be too difficult for students who recently finished high school work. The writer has attempted to include necessary material and discard padding which was often included to make a large volume."[32] Culp in 1942 was Director of Rural Education, Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

The problems of the small and rural schools were 1) that their teachers were less well prepared and had a shorter tenure than the large and city

school teachers, 2) that the uppermost two elementary grades (7-8) were increasingly being taken over by the mushrooming secondary schools, and 3) that they generally were too small and too isolated to offer a socialization program increasingly being advocated and found in progressive schools. Yet the hundreds of school boards for one-and two-teacher schools tenaciously held on to their schools.

Academic and professional preparation of rural teachers as compared to city teachers was woefully inadequate. If the same professional requirement of two to four years training expected of city teachers were to have been adopted in rural schools,"... nearly 62 percent of the rural teachers would be forcibly divorced from their jobs."[33] Yet the demands on the rural teacher for a broader, more comprehensive education to meet the needs of diverse aged students made the teacher preparation problem even more vexing.[34]

Elementary schools, particularly small ones, were being reorganized from the top--by secondary schools--to meet some of their shortcomings. Since an emerging democratic philosophy called for a shift from administrative convenience to the child's interests, attitudes, and activities, secondary schools frequently reorganized grades 7-8 into a vertically integrated program to meet program needs that a one-or two-teacher school could not, or that a small grades 9-12 secondary school alone could not. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips commented that there was no typical elementary school pattern--elementary schools included 9 or 8 or 7 or 6 years, some with kindergartens and some without them. Organization of elementary schools they said fell into two categories: "... (1) that concerned primarily with the activities within the classroom, and (2) that concerned with activities necssary for

interclassroom relationships."[35] And it was the second category about which the one room school was unable to provide the necessary socializing experiences.

Finally, school administration textbook writers were concerned that modern means of transportation were not being utilized for improved school programs. The old one and a half mile walking distance dogma was being held too closely. Small rural schools ranged in size from two to seven pupils; the average rural school had from 12 to 15 pupils. Combining schools and utilizing modern transportation held the possibility that a large enough pupil base could be established for a complete school program, including a socializing one.[36] Textbook writers wished to consolidate small schools into larger ones to overcome program isolation, but they also wished to avoid the perceived anonymity and crime of the larger community.[37]

Growth of Secondary Education

Whereas in 1900 only about ten percent of the 14 to 18 year olds in the United States were enrolled in high schools, by 1936 approximately 65-70 percent were enrolled in high schools.[38] High school or secondary education became synonomous with the people's college - in fact, since the junior college's founding in 1902 at Joliet, Illinois, many secondary schools included grades 13 and 14, junior college. Junior high schools, founded about 1909-10 in California and Ohio also swelled secondary school enrollments.[39] This tremendous expansion of secondary education spurred an administrative literature focus all its own.

In the twentieth century, the American public began to value extended schooling for their children and for themselves. From approximately 6,000 public secondary schools, 20,000 secondary school teachers and a half million

secondary school students in 1900, the numbers by 1936 had risen to almost 26,000 schools, 270,000 teachers, and 6,000,000 students. By 1940 there were between 6,500,000 and 7,000,000 students enrolled in public secondary schools. This was nothing short of phenomenal growth.[40]

As secondary education grew in magnitude and importance, so did the principalship of ever-increasing sized high schools. From an average size of 124 pupils in 1918, the high school had grown to an average of 233 in 1928, almost double in size.[41] The median size of high schools was reported in the National Survey of Secondary Education data as 721 pupils in 1932.[42] By 1940 Newson, Langfitt and others, ten practicing principals of secondary schools, were impressed enough with the number of and the problems of large secondary schools that they wrote a textbook Administrative Practices in Large High Schools. The ten contributing principals were at schools ranging from a 1050 pupil, 35 teacher junior high school to a 4000 pupil, 160 teacher senior high school.

Secondary education had grown so fast not only in numbers, organization, and scope but also in programs and purposes that its fundamental functions were not well delineated and accepted even by school administrators and teachers. To help remedy this crisis of identity, the Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education, Department of Secondary-School Principals, National Education Association published in 1936 the following list of controversial issues:

Issue I: Shall secondary education be provided at public expense for all normal individuals or for only a limited number?

Issue II: Shall secondary education seek to retain all pupils in school as long as they wish to remain, or shall it transfer them to other agencies under educational supervision when, in the judgment of the school authorities, these agencies promise to serve better the pupils' immediate and probable future needs?

Issue III: Shall secondary education be concerned only with the welfare and progress of the individual, or with these only as they promise to contribute to the welfare and progress of society?

Issue IV: Shall secondary education provide a common curriculum for all, or differentiated offerings?

Issue V: Shall secondary education include vocational training or shall it be restricted to general education?

Issue VI: Shall secondary education be primarily directed toward preparation for advanced studies, or shall it be primarily concerned with the value of its own courses, regardless of a student's future academic career?

Issue VII: Shall secondary education accept conventional school subjects as fundamental categories under which school experiences shall be classified and presented to students, or shall it arrange and present experiences in fundamental categories directly related to the performance of such functions of secondary schools in a democracy as increasing the ability and the desire better to meet socio-civic, economic, health, leisure-time, vocational, and pre-professional problems and situations?

Issue VIII: Shall secondary education present merely organized knowledge, or shall it also assume responsibility for attitudes and ideals?

Issue IX: Shall secondary education seek merely the adjustment of students to prevailing social ideals, or shall it seek the reconstruction of society?

Issue X: Granting that education is a "gradual, continuous, unitary process," shall secondary education be presented merely as a phase of such a process, or shall it be organized as a distinct but closely articulating part of the entire education program, with peculiarly emphasized functions of its own?[43]

DIFFERENTIATION OF ADMINISTRATION

With growth in length and breadth of schooling expected by the public came also growth in the numbers and types of school functionaries. School administration was increasingly divided into distinct conceptual categories, and with a growing cadre of middle managers, school administrators at various

levels tried to differentiate their roles and responsibilities. This differentiation effort was especially noticeable between superintendents and principals. Mention has already been made of the growth of a special body of literature concerning secondary education.

Administration - Curriculum-Making - Supervision

Whereas older textbooks dealt with administration, supervision and curriculum-making in one volume and as unitary or at least as closely integrated school administration tasks, textbooks of the 1930's and 1940's began to treat only one or two of these functions in a single volume.[1] This delimitation probably reflected the growing knowledge in school administration as well as the growing size of schools and school districts. To handle such growth, categories had to be established and topics addressed has to be delimited.

In 1934 Cox and Langfitt stated in the preface of their 674 page textbook: "This volume undertakes to deal with the administrative and supervisory functions of the high school principal and his assistants."[2] But by 1940 Koos and others in 662 pages only intended to deal with administration, organization, and management, as opposed to supervision and curriculum-making.[3] The effort to write a comprehensive text in school administration seemed abandoned. Instead comprehensive administrator reading lists were included in texts, and specialized textbooks were published.

Examples of the former are lists given by Koos and others (1940) and Douglass (1945). Koos and others' literature list included eleven books plus twenty-seven periodicals, seven of which dealt almost exclusively with secondary education. Interestingly, Elwood P. Cubberley and George D. Strayer

were not included in the entries.[4] Douglass' list of professional reading for the high school principal was divided into three parts: 1) periodicals, 15 entries; 2) professional books, 55 entries in 10 categories (General Secondary Education, High School Administration, Methods of Teaching, Tests and Measurements, Guidance, Supervision, Curriculum, Activities, General School Administration, Psychology of Secondary Education); and 3) general reading, to include regular readings of at least one "high-grade, relatively reliable newspaper" (six to choose from), one periodical from each of three classes (conservative or reactionary, liberal or progressive, middle-of-the-road or neutral: ten to choose from), assorted small books and pamphlets plus per year six or eight well-selected current books, a few books of current fiction and two or three older books of superlative caliber (Bible to Sandburg's Abraham Lincoln, The Prairie Years).[5] Of course Douglass' own 600+ page volume should be read. In the extensive thirty-one page bibliography given at the end of the Douglass book, further reading is suggested. Interestingly again, Cubberley is not referenced at all (although he was cited on the relationship of principal to janitor in one chapter and was referenced in the professional readings list) and Strayer is referenced only once. These lists represent the then current professional sources and the typical topical areas of concern for the '30's - '40's administrator.

Specialized books in school administration could also be found. Butterworth and Ruegsegger's Administering Pupil Transportation (197 pages) is an example of specialized books. It was based on Ruegsegger's dissertation and included what is in the book a 35 page scorecard for measuring effectiveness and quality of service of busses, routes and transportation systems.[6] In other words, it was "how to" provide optimum service at minimum cost.[7] Further

examples of specialized books were Johnston's Administering the Guidance Program, Magill's Administering Vocational Education, Pennock's Administration and the Rule of Law, and a series of yearbooks published by the University of Chicago Press as a result of the Annual Conferences of Administrative Officers of Public and Private Schools: Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-Economic Change, Critical Issues in Educational Administration, Democratic Practices in School Administration and others.

Curriculum. Curricular emphases of the public school moved haltingly in this period from college preparation to life and living -- citizenship, health, recreation, vocation.[8] The expanded school curriculum was not always taught in the same building under one roof, but it was offered perhaps in a specialized vocational school and in a neighboring high school. The ten critical issues identified by the Department of Secondary-School Principals illustrates the uncertainty of a curriculum expanded beyond preparation for college. Cox and Langfitt commented:

> The preparation of adolescents for the vocational occupations of life always has been one objective of realistic secondary education. Again and again subjects have been introduced into the public schools with the support of labor groups and of business and industrial leaders because of their vocational importance. Drawing, manual training, commercial subjects, teacher-training, physics, and chemistry exemplify this process.[9]

Certainly the effect of so-called Progressive Educators could be seen. A socialization program was advocated for rural schools,[10] an activities program was seen as a necessary part of a modern elementary school,[11] and the extra-curriculum including health and physical education, assumed a greater and greater portion of school time at the secondary level[12] -- all because schools were perceived to be embryonic societies and pupils were perceived

to learn through directed living. The expanded curriculum brought with it new administrative titles -- Curriculum Coordinator, Dean of Girls, Dean of Boys, Director of Vocational Guidance, Director of Citizenship, etc.[13] Generally there was a movement away from strict curriculum tracks to broader, more integrated studies centered on a core of courses taken by all.[14]

Supervision by analyzing the writings concerning supervision during this period, one can see a change from supervision as inspectorial and state mandated to supervision focusing on the improvement of teaching and cooperatively undertaken by administrator and teacher.

Although others had written advocating cooperative supervision,[15] Ford as late as 1938 in his book's first chapter, "The Function of Supervision," said following conventional wisdom:

> The point has been reached when the state must organize an educational program in keeping with the times if school systems are to render the services expected of them. Not only must it organize such a program, but it must also follow the example of big business enterprises in seeing to it that the program is efficiently carried out -- hence the necessity for effective supervision.[16]

To the end stated, Ford devised scorecards with IQ-like quotients by which to rate teachers in the following areas: Environmental and Biological Background for Effective Study, The Assignment, Supervised Study, Controls of Conduct, Beginning Motor Control, Inductive-Deductive Procedure, Appreciation, The Activity Program, The Drill Procedure, The Project Methods, The Problem-Solving Procedure, The Review Procedure, The Testing-Grading Procedure, The Technique of Socialization, The Lecture Procedure, General Principles Applicable to All Procedures, and Personality Traits. Thus a teacher could receive 100 on Personality Traits and 80 on Teaching Appreciation, etc.[17] Obviously the writer believed "... that practically every educational effort should be measured."[18]

Five years later (1943) Koopman, Miel and Misner in their chapter, "The Nature of Educational Leadership," were advocating that consultative services replace supervision and, to turn the tables completely around, that teachers should evaluate consultative services received.[19]

A middle ground between the two extremes just cited (and probably nearer actual practice) was taken by Koos and others when they said "... a study of teacher-rating plans and their actual results must convince anyone that a rating card cannot be a substitute for the rater's own extended training in values and techniques in all the subjects, his possession of a modern point of view in education, common sense, an analytical mind, and a sense of justice."[20] Other writers such as Cooke, however, turned the traditional supervisory tables also and devised performance checklists with which to evaluate principals, superintendents and even school board members.[21] (Item Number 1 on the school board rating scale -- Recognizes Superintendent as Head of School System, 0 points for "Refuses to recognize superintendent" through 45 points for "often advises superintendent how to run schools" to 90 points for the school board member who "Never interferes with administrative affairs.")[22] Cooke also presented a rating scale by which pupils could evaluate teachers. Everybody could get into the act of cooperative supervision.

Superintendent - Principal Roles

Growth in numbers of schools (particularly secondary schools), in the size of school districts, and in an expanded curriculum brought increased pressures on a district's chief educational officer to seek administrative assistance. No longer could a superintendent in a city school system, for example, be the building administrator for every school in the district.

Yet practice varied widely; in small villages, and there were hundreds of them, superintendents also functioned as principals while the principals of high school districts (e.g., California union high schools, Montana county high schools, Illinois township and community high schools) were in function superintendents reporting directly to a board of education.[23] Textbook writers belabored the increasing importance and responsibility of a separate office called principal, yet as was shown there were few unique responsibilities attached to the office. Therefore, the following discussion in this paper will treat the principalship and superintendency as unitary in academic and professional qualifications, certification, duties, and salary unless distinct differentiation was made in the textbooks reviewed.

Academic and Professional Qualifications

In 1934 it was reported that generally school administrators held bachelor's degrees. A few states (California, Maryland, and New York were given as leaders) required the Master's degree to qualify for administrative positions.[24] Whereas in 1930-31 among secondary administrators approximately 4.7% had no degree; 47.0%, the bachelor's; 46.0%, the master's, and 2.2%, the doctor's, by 1940-41 1.8% had no degree; 23.3%, the bachelor's; 70.4%, the master's, and 4.5% the doctor's.[25] School administrators obviously were rapidly attaining advanced schooling and a trend toward the master's degree as a minimum was obvious.

The academic training received by school administrators was a typical liberal arts degree program with "... the gaps in training which seem unavoidable with the present elective system." Professionally school administrators generally lacked training in the newer curricular fields such as vocational subjects, music, art, and physical education.[26]

Nevertheless, professional progress was being made as degree attainment rose. Douglass at the close of the period under consideration was so optimistic that he professed:

> It seems most probable that the high-school principalship of the near future, along with the school superintendency, will require not only distinctly superior, mental, and personal characteristics but continued technical and professional training, and affording responsibility and prestige on a par with that of the more generally recognized professions of medicine, a law, and architecture.[27]

Certification

With rising academic and professional attainments came rising certification requirements. Regional accrediting associations and state universities that accredited high school programs certainly had a significant role in promoting and upholding certification minimums. In 1905 only one state had a special administrative credential (for superintendent).[28] By 1923, seven states distinguished between teacher and administrator certificates, and by 1934, 27 states had separate teacher and administrator certificates.[29] The requirements for administrative certification in 1934 were typically college or normal school graduation, and one to five years' experience; over half of the states required 20 semester hours of professional courses (school administration and supervision being the most frequent) and 12 states specified that the professional courses must be graduate school work.[30]

Duties

It was in administrative duties that differentiation, though small, between superintendents and principals was reported in the textbooks. Interestingly two textbooks reported studies that showed the overwhelming

majority of both superintendents and principals were continuing to teach in addition to performing their administrative duties.[31] And it was the administrative duty of appointing or nominating teachers that seemed to be most vexing for superintendents and principals. Sometimes local school board politics prevented either the superintendent's or the principal's selecting teachers.[32] Since superintendents had been longer in the business of selecting teachers, they evidently did not relinquish that duty readily when they actually held it. Elementary and secondary school administration textbook writers argued for the school principal's having at least advisory authority in the selection of school personnel, for the principal has "... intimate acquaintance with the positions to be filled."[33]

Realistically, administrative power was granted to the principal by the superintendent and the school board; and in effect, the superintendent controlled the duties of the principalship.[34] Thus the superintendent could make of a principalship anything from its being a clerical position to its having carte blanche concerning educative influences of a school. The critical administrative problem was "... to give the principal real professional responsibility and yet not so much independence as to endanger articulation with elementary and specialized schools."[35] It seemed clear that a principal should approach the school board through or with the superintendent.[36]

In practice the superintendency and principalship, where they were separate offices, were ill-defined. Ayer's extensive study reported by Koos and others attempted by means of "A Checking List of 1000 duties of School Administrators" to differentiate which office, superintendent or principal, was performing certain duties. In the nine categories of

administrative duties in Ayer's study (I. 101 General Control duties, II. 169 Executive Management duties, III. 153 Business Management duties, IV. 86 Teaching Staff duties, V. 120 Pupil duties, VI. 70 Curriculum duties, VII. 79 Special Activities duties, VIII. 106 Instruction duties, and IX. 166 Special Services duties), it was found that principals were performing 85% of the same duties as superintendents. The only category in which there appeared much variation was business management where principals performed only two-thirds as many duties as superintendents.[37] Cox and Langfitt tended to confirm this differentiation, for they report in the Preface of their textbook that "... building programs and educational finance are essentially the responsibilities of school superintendents and not of principals ..."[38] In sum then, except for busines management and closely related duties, superintendents and principals were by and large performing the same type functions, thus making the areas of responsibility overlapping and possible sources of conflict.

Salary

Remembering that superintendents were often supervising principals in practice and vice versa, one can assume the principal's or the superintendent's salary was the same in many cases. Data were reported for 1930-31 (the year salaries were generally the highest for teachers and administrators), 1938-39, and 1942-43. See Table I below.

Table I Median Yearly Salaries for Junior High and Senior High School Principals for the Years 1930-31, 1933-34, 1940-41 By Smallest Sized (Pop.:2,500-5,000) and Largest Sized (Pop.: 100,000+) cities

Year	Position	Size 2,500-5,000	Size 100,000+	Relationship Small to Large Sized Population
*1930-31	Jr. High Principal	$1775	$4500	150% increase
	Sr. High Principal	2403	5100	112% increase
*1938-39	Jr. High Principal	1579	4359	176% increase
	Sr. High Principal	2156	4758	121% increase
**1942-43	Jr. High Principal	1757	4422	152% increase
	Sr. High Principal	2317	4913	112% increase

*Compiled from Koos and others, p. 422.
**Compiled from Douglass, p. 550.

Using elementary teachers salary (1930-31) as a base of 100, principals (junior and senior high included) salaries ranged 50 to 150 percent above the base.[39] The wider range of salaries at the junior high administrative level (see Table I above) was the result of a higher percentage of principals at that level in the smaller communities likely being women, whereas men were more likely to be principals in larger communities and to be paid more.[40] The writers thought administrative salaries were competitive with, though certainly not as high as, other professions and businesses requiring like amounts of ability, training, and experience.[41]

Douglass also reported superintendents' salaries for 1942-43. They ranged from $3359 in the smallest villages (pop.: 2,500-5,000) to $8542 per year in the largest cities (pop.: 100,000+). Where there were superintendents separate and apart from principals in the smallest villages, superintendents were likely to earn approximately half again as much as the high school principals, but in the largest cities, superintendents were likely to earn almost three quarters again as much. For both the principalship and the superintendency, the more lucrative positions in the 1930's and 1940's were in the big cities. It is informative to note

also that administrative salaries had not by 1942-43, the beginning of World War II, reached again the levels of 1930-31.

Finally, there had to be some less formal, survival relationships between a principal and the school district's central office. A glimpse into those relationships was given when Cox and Langfitt suggested that a principal's fiat was law unless and until he was over-ruled by the superintendent and/or the community.[42] It was also suggested that another relationship was "protector" of teachers from central office supervisors who could snuff out originality and initiative in the classroom.[43] And at the end of a long book (674 pages) Cox and Langfitt gave "The Beginning Principal" two pieces of survival advice: your "... conduct must conform to the standards set by influential conservative citizens"[44] and on the next to the last page of the text: "... there is a very high correlation between the administrative competency of a principal and his personal solvency."[45]

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: PRACTICE AND CONCEPT

What was happening in American society surrounding the Depression and what was happening in the world during the 1930's and 1940's surrounding development of totalitarian versus democratic states could not be ignored. But it was not just these events that caused men--such as John Dewey, Boyd H. Bode, William H. Kilpatrick, George S. Counts--to advance new conceptions of the purpose of education and subsequently of the purpose of school administration. The crux of the matter was whether schools were to be ". . .the agency of society and as such should provide those experiences which will develop in youth the ideals, habits, and skills necessary to enable him to take his place in that society. . ." or whether schools were

to be ". . .the pioneer of society and as such must assume a major share of responsibility for the development of a society which will provide the greatest good for all and produce individuals who are willing to work toward such an end."[1]

Reformulation of the Purposes of Education

The school administration textbook writer who gave a clarion call to reformulate the purposes of education as well as school administration was Jesse H. Newlon. His book Educational Administration As Social Policy, a volume in the American Historical Association's Investigation of the Social Studies in the Schools, was a marker event in the development of the profession and represents even today against the backdrop of administrative efficiency experts a pertinent rethinking of the field. Other textbook writers followed the lead of Newlon, but he was among the first if not the very first in administration to question sharply the then conventional wisdom.

Writing under the heading The Social Purposes of National Systems of Education, Newlon stated that education in the United States had four basic purposes: 1) transmission of the culture, 2) education for citizenship, 3) social control, and 4) vocational efficiency.[2] In attempts to accomplish these purposes, ". . .the American school has, in large measure, been conducted as though it were educating individuals for a static society. A few have discerned the significance of the rapid social changes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."[3] Even the scientific method, which had succeeded in eliminating some obsolete materials and adding other new items to the school curriculum, had failed to be concerned with the basic social and educational purposes of schools and had not questioned the

established order of things.[4] The essence of Newlon's criticism was

> that the American system of education has largely reflected laissez-faire individualism; that the scientific method in education, while making a desirable contribution, has at the same time tended to crystallize traditional educational procedures; that although a critical school of thought has arisen that would bring education more closely into contact with life and give it definite social direction, American education as a whole has, as yet, been but little affected by this new movement

that would fashion American education not only on ". . .the corporate character of modern life. . ." but also on ". . .an extension of the principle of democracy in the direction of planning our industrial and economic life under collective control."[5] These were bold words, obviously reflecting the thinking of "progressive educators."

Ten years later the words would not seem so bold as other school administration textbook writers joined Newlon in a call for reformulating the purpose of schooling. Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips proclaimed that democratic socialization should be the unitary objective of education.[6] Koopman, Miel, and Misner observed: "In a present-day totalitarian state the individual is taught to cooperate with the state according to an authoritarian political theory. In a present-day democratic state the individual learns to cooperate with the state and with other individuals according to a democratic political theory."[7] With a reformulation of the purposes of education, a reconcentualization of school administration was in order.

Democratic Administration

In school administration textbooks, writers during the early years of the period began rather subtly and unobtrusively to suggest that teachers and administrators should cooperate in improving teaching through the supervisory process and that the day of the autocratic administrator should be past.[8] By 1939 Cooke, sensing a change, entitled the first chapter of his book

"Considering Teachers As Human Beings" and reported that Business and industry had already discovered the salutary effects of attention to workers and their morale.[9] He viewed teacher participation in administration as ". . . an effective means of educating teachers in service."[10] Evidently professors of school administration in Missouri did not necessarily agree, for of teachers, superintendents and principals, and professors of school administration surveyed, the professors were the most conservative in their view of how much teachers should participate in administrative functions.[11]

Generally, school administration textbook writers after 1940 portrayed teachers as relative equals of administrators, as necessary to execute administrative policy, and as valuable contributors to cooperative procedures which, they said, produced better plans and programs than one person alone could. Because of these factors, ". . . teachers should share in the exercise of administrative control over the schools" and ". . . democracy should prevail in school administration. . . ."[12] Teacher participation meant democratic administration.

Koopman, Miel, and Misner in their Democracy In School Administration attempted to ". . .translate democracy into action", in other words, to offer a practice-oriented, "how to" approach for extant democratic administration philosophy and theory.[13] Getting the foundation of their beliefs up front, they used an excerpted version of Dewey's "Democracy for the Teacher" as the textbook's frontispiece.[14] According to the writers, "Group policy-making is an essential element in democratic administration."[15] To this end, a policy making, individual school as well as a city wide committee system for enfranchising teachers in their democratic administration roles and responsibilities was proposed.[16] The writers' administrative credo was summarized in twelve Imperative Considerations given at the end of

the text:

1. The substitution of group control for individual control
2. The implementation of purposes through appropriate internal organization
3. The utilization of group reactions in administration of education
4. The facing of social realities
5. The building of an organization broad enough to guarantee flexibility
6. The building of an organization functional enough to protect the teacher's energies
7. Provision for the needs of all groups simultaneously
8. Continuous appraisal as a guarantee of progress
9. Cooperation as a residue of a great variety of group activities
10. Participation as an aid to learning
11. Community improvement through a dynamic functional curriculum
12. The abolition of administrative vetoes, reservations, and sacred prerogatives.[17]

But there was not unanimous agreement that group procedures, teacher participation, and democratic administration would necessarily improve schools, teaching, or administration. Douglass wrote in his 1945 textbook that it was questionable whether the teacher has inherent rights to participate in administration unless ". . . .the school is benefitted by (1) his own growth to greater effectiveness and (2) his improving the administration of rules, practices, or curriculum as the result of a greater understanding of them; and unless it can be shown that the advantages are greater than the disadvantages, such as consumption of staff time, slowing down of actions or decisions or maladministration to some degree or in some instances."[18]

Democratic administration had been proposed and an attempt at engineering it into action had been given. One estimate, however, put the actual practice in secondary schools of democratic administration at perhaps half of the schools, at least to some extent.[19]

Practice - Theory Dualism

Despite the reformulation of the purposes of education and the

conceptualization of new functions of school administration, average practices--some like Newlon would probably say the conventional wisdom in new clothes--continued to influence heavily the formulation and practice of school administration. The scientific movement in education, the efficiency movement in school administration, and the school survey technique in public schools all tended methodologically to emphasize central tendency and average practice.

Typically textbooks of this period would have chapters on buildings and grounds; equipment and supplies; layout of the principal's office; school office standards, procedures, and forms; school finance, and business administration; selection of the staff; organization of the curriculum; the daily schedule; personnel records; school publicity; teacher's loads; and improvement of teaching personnel in-service. Such chapters would be filled with numerous tables, lists, and charts indicating average practice in various sized communities in various parts of the country. Butterworth and Ruegsegger stated very plainly one purpose of their textbook on transportation to be the determination of prevailing standards of practice and said: "In this field, the 'ideal' is presumably that which is ahead of today's practice; the superior practice of a few systems today becomes the ideal toward which all systems are striving tomorrow."[20]

Surveys of all kinds almost always reported average practice, and there were several nationally important and influential ones cited. Among the surveys read widely by the textbook writers were the following:

1.) Cooper and Koos, National Survey of Secondary Education, 1932

2.) Evenden and others, National Survey of the Education of Teachers, 1933

3.) Co-operative Study of Secondary School Standards, 1938

4.) Cocking and Williams, The Education of School Administrators, 1940

5.) Lund, Education of School Administrators, 1941

Eighteen of the twenty chapters in Administrative Practices In Large High Schools were written by ten practicing principals who reported practices in their respective high schools. Conforming with this emphasis was the intent of Koopman, Miel, Misner in Democracy In School Administration when they indicated the book was for teachers who might want to know the experiences of practitioners in implementing democratic administration.[21] On balance, there was a relatively great emphasis on collecting, analyzing, and reporting average practice--the conventional.

Functions of Administration

What then were the functions of school administration? There were at least two schools of thought.

On the one hand there were those who followed Newlon and indicated the functions to be as follows:

1) To examine society critically and to participate with a community and lead in the formulation of social and educational policy[22]

2) To discover leadership and enable it to flourish[23]

3) To discover the social purposes of education and to move schools and schooling effectively toward those purposes[24]

4) To promote self expression of all school personnel toward socially desirable purposes and values[25]

5) To organize school as a living laboratory in democratic political theory[26]

6) To cultivate an authority of reason to supplant an outmoded authority of position[27]

7) To interpret the community to the school and the school to the community so these each can understand the other's needs[28]

Those, represented by Douglass, reluctant to relinquish the conventional wisdom indicated the functions somewhat differently:

1) To engineer the contributions of the educational scientist into useful forms[29]

2) To organize and plan the work of the school as efficiently as possible[30]

3) To supervise and lead in the improvement of teaching[31]

4) To manage the school day to day toward identified purposes of education[32]

5) To keep adequate records and accounts of school activities and functions[33]

6) To protect teachers and other staff who pioneer in improving practice[34]

7) To cooperate with the community and parents who are the stockholders and consumers of the school[35]

By the end of the period even the traditionalists no longer perceived schools as isolated institutions from their communities. Although the traditionalists would not agree with Newlon that the conventional forms and methods of school administration were relatively unimportant and sterile, they would agree with him that the school administration problems of the day were largely political and social and that preparation for service should not confine itself to the mechanical, technical, and pedogogical but rather should include a study of history, sociology, anthropology, political science, and philosophy.[36] School administration had almost become an applied social science.

FOOTNOTES

INTRODUCTION

[1]N. William Newsom and R. Emerson Langfitt, eds., Administrative Practices in Large High Schools (New York: American Book Co., 1940), p. 1.

INHERITED INFLUENCES AND PROBLEMS

[1]Samuel E. Weber, Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937), p. 17.

[2]Ibid., p. 64.

[3]Dennis H. Cooke, Administering the Teaching Personnel (Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Co., 1939), p. 304.

[4]Weber, Cooperative Administration, p. 65.

[5]Ibid., p. 17.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Leonard V. Koos and others, Administering the Secondary School (New York: American Book Co., 1940), p. 330.

[8]Koos and others, Administering, p. 327; Cooke, Administering, pp. 121-122.

[9]Weber, Cooperative Administration, pp. 127-129.

[10]Koos and others, Administering, p. 327.

[11]Ibid., p. 328.

[12]Frederick A. Ford, The Instructional Program: Its Organization and Administration (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1938), p. 46.

[13]Koos and others, Administering, p. 415.

[14]Ibid.

[15]David V. Tiedeman, Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary (Cambridge, MA: The New England School Development Council, 1956), p. vii.

[16]Weber, Cooperative Administration, p. 173.

[17]Koos and others, Administering, pp. 418-419.

[18]R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955), p. 543.

[19]Cooke, Administering, p. 284.

[20]Koos and others, Administering, p. 418.

[21]Ibid., pp. 429-430.

[22]Cooke, Administering, pp. 70-72, 136.

[23]Koos and others, Administering, pp. 346, 420-422.

[24]Ibid., p. 346.

[25]Butts, A Cultural History, p. 544.

[26]Koos and others, Administering, pp. 423-441.

[27]Cooke, Administering, p. 253 and Weber, Cooperative Administration, pp. 339-347.

[28]Cooke, Administering, pp. 240-241.

[29]Koos and others, Administering, pp. 406-412.

[30]James H. Dougherty, Frank A. Gorman, and Claude A. Phillips, Elementary School Organization and Management (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1936) and Vernon H. Culp, How To Manage A Rural School (Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1942).

[31]Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, Elementary School, p. vi.

[32]Culp, How To Manage, p. 1.

[33]Ibid., p. 9.

[34]Ibid., p. 19.

[35]Dougherty. Gorman, and Phillips, Elementary School, p. 21.

[36]Culp, How To Manage, p. 9.

[37]Ibid., pp. 13-17.

[38]Koos and others, Administering, p. 1; also Phillip W.L. Cox and R. Emerson Langfitt, High School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Co., 1934), p. vii.

[39]Butts, A Cultural History, pp. 540-543; also see Newsom and Langfitt, Administrative Practices, p. 6.

[40]Butts, A Cultural History, p. 542; also see Newsom and Langfitt, Administrative Practices, p. 5.

[41]Cox and Langfitt, High School, pp. 9-10.

[42]Koos and others, Administering, p. 7.

[43]Newsom and Langfitt, Administrative Practices, pp. 10-11.

DIFFERENTIATION OF ADMINISTRATION

[1]An example of a comprehensive textbook is Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public School Administration (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1922).

[2]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. ix.

[3]Koos and others, Administering, p. 6.

[4]Ibid., pp. 9-12.

[5]Harl R. Douglass, Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools (New York: Ginn and Co., 1945), pp. 554-568.

[6]Julian E. Butterworth and Virgil Ruegsegger, Administering Pupil Transportation (Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, Inc., 1941), pp. 51-86.

[7]Ibid., p. 89.

[8]Koos and others, Administering, p. 2.

[9]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. 20.

[10]Culp, How To Manage, pp. 67-69.

[11]Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, Elementary School, p. 10.

[12]Koos and others, Administering, p. 130.

[13]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. 47.

[14]Koos and others, Administering, pp. 14-17 and 42-49.

[15]Weber, Cooperative Administration (1937).

[16]Ford, The Instructional Program, p. 3.

[17]Ibid., pp. 146-206.

[18]Ibid., p. 50.

[19]G. Robert Koopman, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner, Democracy in School Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1943), p. 55.

[20]Koos and others, Administering, p. 370.

[21]Cooke, Administering, pp. 208-222.

[22]Ibid., p. 218.

[23]Koos and others, Administering, p. 463.

[24]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. 50.

[25]Douglass, Organization, p. 546.

[26]Koos and others, Administering, p. 454.

[27]Douglass, Organization, p. 546.

[28]David B. Tyack and Robert Cummings, "Leadership in American Public Schools Before 1954" in Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand, Editors, Educational Administration: The Developing Decades (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977), p. 59.

[29]Koos and others, Administering, p. 457.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Cooke, Administering, p. 246; Koos and others, Administering, p. 464.

[32]Cooke, Administering, pp. 28, 57-58; Weber, Cooperative Administration, p. 187.

[33]Koos and others, Administering, p. 357; see also Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, Elementary School, p. 341.

[34]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. 47.

[35]Koos and others, Administering, p. 463.

[36]Douglass, Organization, p. 588.

[37]Koos and others, Administering, p. 464.

[38]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. x.

[39]Koos and others, Administering, p. 445.

[40]Ibid., p. 422.

[41]Ibid., p. 445.

[42]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. 53.

[43]Ibid., p. 664.

[44]Ibid., p. 669.

[45]Ibid., p. 673.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION: PRACTICE AND CONCEPT

[1]Newsom and Langfitt, Administrative Practices, p. 1.

[2]Jesse H. Newlon, Educational Administration as Social Policy (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), pp. 54-58.

[3]Ibid., p. 64.

[4]Ibid., p. 66.

[5]Ibid., p. 69.

[6]Dougherty, Gorman, and Phillips, Elementary School, p. 43.

[7]Koopman, Miel, and Misner, Democracy, p. 20.

[8]Weber, Cooperative Administration, pp. 327-328.

[9]Cooke, Administering, pp. 1 and 8.

[10]Ibid., p. 318.

[11]Ibid., p. 322.

[12]Koos and others, Administering, pp. 481-482.

[13]Koopman, Miel, and Misner, Democracy, p. v.

[14]Ibid., pp. xviii-xviv.

[15]Ibid., p. 50.

[16]Ibid., pp. 76-121.

[17]Ibid., p. 322.

[18]Douglass, Organization, p. 573.

[19]Ibid., p. 572.

[20]Butterworth and Ruegsegger, Adminstering Pupil Transportation, p. 4.

[21]Koopman, Miel, and Misner, Democracy, p. v.

[22]Newlon, Educational Administration, p. 234.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., p. 252.

[25]Koopman, Miel, and Misner, Democracy, p. 42.

[26]Ibid., p. 81 ff.

[27]Koos and others, Administering, p. 172.

[28]Ibid., p. 635 ff.

[29]Weber, Cooperative Administration, pp. 20-21.

[30]Cox and Langfitt, High School, p. 69.

[31]Ibid., p. 69.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., p. 67.

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid., p. 668.

[36]Newlon, Educational Administration, pp. 252-264.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Textbooks

Brown, Edwin J. Secondary School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1938.

*Butterworth, Julian E., and Virgil Ruegsegger. Administering Pupil Transportation. Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, Inc., 1941.

*Cooke, Dennis H. Administering the Teaching Personnel. Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Co., 1939.

*Cox, Phillip W. L., and R. Emerson Langfitt. High School Administration and Supervision. New York: American Book Co., 1934.

*Culp, Vernon H. How to Manage A Rural School. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1942.

*Douglass, Harl R. Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools. New York: Ginn and Co., 1945.

*Dougherty, James H., Frank A. Gorman, and Claude A. Phillips. Elementary School Organization and Management. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

*Ford, Frederick A. The Instructional Program: Its Organization and Administration. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1938.

Grow, Harry R. The Development of Guiding Principles and Policies for the Administration of the Small School System. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1941.

Henzlik, Frank E. School Administration and Education for Administrative Leadership in Towns and Villages. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1943.

Jaggers, Richard E. Administering the County School System. New York: American Book Co., 1934.

Johnston, Edgar G. Administering the Guidance Program. Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, Inc., 1942.

*Koopman, G. Robert, Alice Miel, and Paul J. Misner. Democracy in School Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1943.

*Koos, Leonard V., James M. Hughes, Percival W. Hutson, and William C. Reavis. Administering the Secondary School. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Langfitt, R. Emerson, Frank W. Cyr, and N. William Newsom. The Small High School at Work. New York: American Book Co., 1936.

Magill, Walter H. Administering Vocational Education. Minneapolis: Educational Publishers, Inc., 1941.

Maxwell, Charles R., and L. R. Kilzer. High School Administration. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1936.

*Newlon, Jesse H. Educational Administration As Social Policy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

*Newsom, N. William, and R. Emerson Langfitt. (eds.) Administrative Practices in Large High Schools. New York: American Book Co., 1940.

Pennock, James R. Administration and the Rule of Law. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1941.

Reavis, William C. Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-Economic Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Reavis, William C. Critical Issues in Educational Administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Reavis, William C. Democratic Practices in School Administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Reeder, Ward G. The Administration of Pupil Transportation. Columbus: The Educators Press, 1939.

*Weber, Samuel E. Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937.

*Witham, Ernest C. Problem Studies in School Administration. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1936.

B. Other Sources

Benjamin, Harold. Emergent Conceptions of the School Administrator's Task. November 12, 1938 Cubberley Lecture, Stanford School of Education. Stanford University, CA: Stanford University Press, 1942.

Brubacher, John S. A History of the Problems of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co, 1966.

Butts, R. Freeman. A Cultural History of Western Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955.

Callahan, Raymond E. Changing Conceptions of the Superintendency in Public Education, 1865-1964. Cambridge, MA: The New England School Development Council, 1964.

Cocking, Walter D., and Kenneth R. Williams. The Education of School Administrators. Washington: American Council on Education, 1940.

Cooper, William John, and Leonard V. Koos.(dirs.) National Survey of Secondary Education. Washington: United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 17, 1932.

Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. How To Evaluate a Secondary School. Washington: American Council on Education, 1938.

Edwards, Newton, and Herman G. Richey. The School in the American Social Order. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947.

Evenden, Edward S., and others. National Survey of the Education of Teachers. Washington: United States Office of Education, Bulletin No. 10, 1933.

Good, Harry G., and James D. Teller. A History of Western Education. New York: The Macmillian Co., 1969.

Lund, John. Education of School Administrators. Federal Security Agency, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin 1941, No. 6. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1942.

Tiedeman, David V. Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary. Cambridge, MA: The New England School Development Council, 1956.

Tyack, David B. "Pilgrim's Progress: Toward a Social History of the School Superintendency, 1860-1960." History of Education Quarterly, 16, Fall, 1976, pages 257-300.

Tyack, David B., and Robert Cummings. "Leadership in American Public Schools Before 1954" in Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Raphael O. Nystrand, Editors, Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977, pages 46-66.

* Textbooks reviewed in detail for this paper.